

I am very concerned about the decision by Sinclair Broadcasting to force its stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the presidential election. The use of public airwaves is a privilege granted by the people, free of charge. In return, media companies are obligated by law to serve the public interest. Although Sinclair calls the airing of the anti-Kerry documentary a "news event," its actions smack of a media conglomerate taking advantage of its power and position to bring about an electoral result that will be, presumably, favorable to its bottom line. Actions of this sort that result from media consolidation threaten the very survival of our democracy. At the very least, Sinclair Broadcasting should be required to air a second "news event," one that represents another point of view about Senator Kerry's record.

If Sinclair wants to use its position to advance a particular political view, it should be obliged, at the very least, to give equal time to opposing views.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.

Jennifer Moon
Seattle, Washington